EXHIBIT 27

EXHIBIT 27

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 2 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	Case No. 17-cv-00939-WHA
5	X
6	WAYMO LLC,
7	Plaintiff,
8	- against -
9	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; OTTOMOTTO, LLC;
10	OTTO TRUCKING LLC,
11	Defendants.
12	x
13	
14	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
15	
16	Videotaped 30(b)(6) Deposition
17	of GARY BROWN, taken by Defendants, held
18	at the offices of Morrison & Foerster LLP,
	250 West 55th Street, at 9:59 a.m. on August
19	8, 2017, New York, New York, before Jineen
	Pavesi, a Registered Professional Reporter,
20	Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime
	Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New York.
21	
22	
23	
24	Job No. 2671217A
25	Pages 1 - 305
	Page 1

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 3 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	A. That is correct.	10:49:45AM
2	Q. Are there any other	10:49:45AM
3	administrators?	10:49:46AM
4	A. Not that I know of.	10:49:51AM
5	Q. Has Mr. Brown been the	10:49:54AM
6	administrator of the SVN log since January	10:49:56AM
7	of 2015?	10:50:02AM
8	A. I don't believe so.	10:50:05AM
9	Q. Who has been the administrator	10:50:09AM
10	of the SVN log from January 2015 forward,	10:50:10AM
11	if not Mr. Brown?	10:50:14AM
12	A. Sasha Zbrozek was the previous	10:50:20AM
13	administrator.	10:50:22AM
14	Q. And when was Sasha the	10:50:26AM
15	administrator for the SVN log?	10:50:30AM
16	A. I believe from the inception of	10:50:38AM
17	the server in early 2015 through the	10:50:39AM
18	summer, June or July, 2015 sorry, no,	10:50:46AM
19	June, July 2016.	10:50:55AM
20	Q. And after June or July of 2016,	10:51:00AM
21	Mr. Jack Brown took on responsibilities	10:51:03AM
22	for administering the SVN log, is that	10:51:06AM
23	correct?	10:51:10AM
24	A. That is correct.	10:51:10AM
25	Q. You do not have access to the	10:51:22AM
		Page 48

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 4 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	SVN log in the ordinary course of	10:51:23AM
2	business, is that correct?	10:51:25AM
3	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	10:51:29AM
4	A. That is correct.	10:51:31AM
5	Q. So as part of Waymo's	10:51:34AM
6	investigation, someone gave you a copy of	10:51:35AM
7	the SVN log, is that correct?	10:51:37AM
8	A. That is correct.	10:51:41AM
9	Q. And that person, the person who	10:51:44AM
10	gave you a copy of the SVN log was	10:51:46AM
11	Mr. Jack Brown, correct?	10:51:49AM
12	A. No.	10:51:53AM
13	Q. Who gave you a copy of the SVN	10:51:54AM
14	log?	10:51:56AM
15	MR. BAKER: I am going to	10:52:00AM
16	caution the witness not to reveal the	10:52:00AM
17	substance of any attorney-client	10:52:03AM
18	communication, but you can give a name.	10:52:04AM
19	A. Tom Gorman.	10:52:07AM
20	Q. When did Mr. Gorman give you	10:52:08AM
21	the SVN log?	10:52:10AM
22	MR. BAKER: You can give a	10:52:11AM
23	date.	10:52:12AM
24	A. February 21st, 20th or 21st,	10:52:13AM
25	2017.	10:52:25AM
		Page 49

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 5 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	any other person's activity strike	11:05:42AM
2	that.	11:05:46AM
3	Did the log contain records of	11:05:46AM
4	activity from somebody other than	11:05:51AM
5	Mr. Levandowski?	11:05:53AM
6	A. I believe so.	11:06:00AM
7	Q. What other activity did the log	11:06:04AM
8	reflect?	11:06:08AM
9	MR. BAKER: And I don't want	11:06:15AM
10	you to reveal the substance of any	11:06:15AM
11	attorney-client communications.	11:06:17AM
12	THE WITNESS: Sure.	11:06:20AM
13	A. My focus was one user's	11:06:20AM
14	activity, I was not looking for other	11:06:24AM
15	users' activity, that was not the task at	11:06:26AM
16	hand.	11:06:29AM
17	Q. How do you know that the log	11:06:32AM
18	contained records of activity from	11:06:34AM
19	somebody other than Mr. Levandowski?	11:06:36AM
20	A. I believe I saw lines floating	11:06:40AM
21	by when I cat or catenate the contents	11:06:42AM
22	into a terminal, but from then on it was	11:06:53AM
23	solely we call grep-ing, focusing on	11:06:57AM
24	single user's activity, and then I think	11:07:00AM
25	awking, which is another tool, to sum up,	11:07:10AM
		Page 58

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 6 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	retired or refurbished and redeployed if	12:15:37PM
2	deemed still within its life span.	12:15:44PM
3	Q. Waymo performed no forensic	12:15:51PM
4	investigation into the Hewlett-Packard	12:15:52PM
5	workstation assigned to Mr. Levandowski	12:15:55PM
6	for an over three-year period during his	12:15:58PM
7	employment at Waymo, is that correct?	12:16:00PM
8	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:16:02PM
9	A. That is correct.	12:16:07PM
10	Q. The Hewlett-Packard workstation	12:16:11PM
11	assigned to Mr. Levandowski from 2012 to	12:16:13PM
12	2016 is a computer is it a desktop	12:16:19PM
13	computer?	12:16:26PM
14	A. It appears to be, yes.	12:16:27PM
15	Q. And that would have existed in	12:16:28PM
16	his office at Waymo, right?	12:16:31PM
17	A. Presumably.	12:16:34PM
18	Q. And it would have been	12:16:35PM
19	something he used in the three-and-a-half	12:16:36PM
20	year period that it was assigned to him in	12:16:40PM
21	his office at Waymo, correct?	12:16:43PM
22	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:16:44PM
23	A. Possibly, but not necessarily.	12:16:46PM
24	Q. But you don't know one way or	12:16:51PM
25	the other if he used it?	12:16:52PM
		Page 98

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 7 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	A. No.	12:16:53PM
2	Q. And nobody asked you to	12:16:54PM
3	inquire, to conduct a forensic review of	12:16:58PM
4	that device to determine if he did	12:17:00PM
5	anything improper with it, correct?	12:17:07PM
6	A. That is correct, but with the	12:17:13PM
7	caveat that the lack of analysis of	12:17:17PM
8	another machine does not wash away the	12:17:22PM
9	wrongdoings on another machine, that's no	12:17:25PM
10	indication of not doing something.	12:17:28PM
11	Q. In order to determine the full	12:17:35PM
12	scope of potential wrongdoing, in your	12:17:39PM
13	opinion should Waymo have conducted a	12:17:43PM
14	forensic investigation of the	12:17:46PM
15	Hewlett-Packard workstation?	12:17:47PM
16	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:17:49PM
17	A. All feasible rocks should be	12:17:57PM
18	turned over, but there have been multiple	12:18:02PM
19	occurrences where inventory management	12:18:07PM
20	personnel reimaged devices before forensic	12:18:12PM
21	analysis could take place.	12:18:18PM
22	Q. And in your opinion, one	12:18:22PM
23	feasible rock that should have been turned	12:18:29PM
24	over was a review of the Hewlett-Packard	12:18:30PM
25	workstation assigned to Mr. Levandowski,	12:18:34PM
		Page 99

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 8 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	is that correct?	12:18:37PM
2	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:18:37PM
3	A. As a forensic analyst, the more	12:18:42PM
4	information, the better.	12:18:44PM
5	But as I said before, it	12:18:47PM
6	doesn't undo other indicators that were	12:18:50PM
7	positively found.	12:18:55PM
8	Q. As a forensic analyst, wouldn't	12:19:02PM
9	you want to know if the card reader was	12:19:07PM
10	attached to the workstation?	12:19:09PM
11	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:19:11PM
12	A. Yes.	12:19:18PM
13	Q. But you don't know the answer	12:19:19PM
14	to that question, right?	12:19:21PM
15	A. Not currently.	12:19:24PM
16	Q. Waymo would never know the	12:19:26PM
17	answer to that question, correct?	12:19:29PM
18	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:19:31PM
19	A. That's uncertain.	12:19:43PM
20	Q. Why is that uncertain?	12:19:45PM
21	A. Depending on retention and host	12:19:50PM
22	monitoring agents, it could potentially be	12:20:00PM
23	determined whether some classes of USB	12:20:08PM
24	devices were connected to these machines,	12:20:12PM
25	but I also would not feel comfortable	12:20:16PM
		Page 100

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 9 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	saying that an absence of this evidence	12:20:19PM
2	means that it didn't happen.	12:20:22PM
3	Q. But you don't know one way or	12:20:25PM
4	the other if it happened?	12:20:27PM
5	A. As I sit here today, no.	12:20:28PM
6	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:20:29PM
7	Q. Sorry, I didn't catch your	12:20:30PM
8	answer to that question.	12:20:31PM
9	A. As I sit here right now, no.	12:20:32PM
10	Q. And Waymo doesn't know one way	12:20:35PM
11	or the other if a card reader was attached	12:20:37PM
12	to the workstation, correct?	12:20:40PM
13	MR. BAKER: Same objection.	12:20:42PM
14	A. No.	12:20:43PM
15	Q. Has Waymo attempted to conduct	12:20:56PM
16	any forensic investigation into the	12:20:58PM
17	Hewlett-Packard workstation since it was	12:21:00PM
18	reassigned to ?	12:21:04PM
19	A. I don't believe so.	12:21:13PM
20	Q. So	12:21:18PM
21	A. And also, so these machines are	12:21:19PM
22	full disk encrypted, that is to say, as	12:21:24PM
23	they are reimaged and redeployed there is	12:21:26PM
24	no evidence left on the hard drive, much	12:21:31PM
25	like when you take your Windows laptop and	12:21:33PM
		Page 101

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 10 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	Do you see that?	04:26:18PM
2	A. I do.	04:26:19PM
3	Q. Do you understand that to mean	04:26:21PM
4	that all the other SVN log data, except	04:26:24PM
5	for Mr. Levandowski's download of December	04:26:30PM
6	11, 2015, is gone?	04:26:34PM
7	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	04:26:38PM
8	A. That's a distinct possibility.	04:26:42PM
9	And if it is true, then I also	04:26:45PM
10	misspoke earlier when I said that the log	04:26:47PM
11	probably contained other people's things,	04:26:52PM
12	too.	04:26:55PM
13	Q. So if Mr. Nardinelli's	04:26:57PM
14	statement is correct, your testimony on	04:26:59PM
15	behalf of Waymo was inaccurate, correct?	04:27:01PM
16	A. It is possible.	04:27:04PM
17	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	04:27:05PM
18	A. Also, as a professional log	04:27:09PM
19	diver, I'll call myself, when we're doing	04:27:13PM
20	investigations, we don't keep things that	04:27:17PM
21	are not deemed explicitly relevant for	04:27:24PM
22	what we are trying to prove.	04:27:26PM
23	It is bad data stewardship, it	04:27:31PM
24	takes up space, and it makes noise.	04:27:34PM
25	Q. What were you asked to prove	04:27:36PM
		Page 229

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 11 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	here?	04:27:38PM
2	MR. BAKER: Objection, I am	04:27:39PM
3	going to caution you not to reveal the	04:27:43PM
4	substance of any attorney-client	04:27:44PM
5	communications.	04:27:46PM
6	If you can answer that question	04:27:46PM
7	without doing that, please do.	04:27:48PM
8	A. I did not pull the SVN log	04:27:52PM
9	data, I'm just speaking to the frame of	04:27:55PM
10	mind of why the entirety of all users'	04:27:56PM
11	logs may not be present.	04:28:04PM
12	For example, in what I've	04:28:05PM
13	produced to support my declaration, I'm	04:28:07PM
14	not pulling and presenting the bit9 logs	04:28:10PM
15	of any of a hundred thousand other Google	04:28:13PM
16	employees because it is simply not	04:28:16PM
17	relevant to the investigation at hand.	04:28:18PM
18	Q. That wasn't my question.	04:28:20PM
19	What were you being asked to	04:28:25PM
20	prove as part of your forensic	04:28:26PM
21	investigation?	04:28:27PM
22	MR. BAKER: Same instruction	04:28:27PM
23	and also objection to the form.	04:28:28PM
24	A. These logs showed that 14,000	04:28:33PM
25	files and change were downloaded on	04:28:36PM
		Page 230

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 12 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	December 11th from an IP address that	04:28:39PM
2	could be traced to Mr. Levandowski's work	04:28:42PM
3	computer.	04:28:44PM
4	Q. When were you asked to prove	04:28:44PM
5	that?	04:28:45PM
6	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	04:28:50PM
7	A. Sometime between August and	04:28:51PM
8	October 2016.	04:28:53PM
9	Q. Why didn't you look at the SVN	04:28:57PM
10	log data when you were first engaged in	04:28:59PM
11	the investigation in February or March of	04:29:01PM
12	2015 sorry, of 2016?	04:29:02PM
13	A. I did not know it existed.	04:29:14PM
14	Q. Wouldn't it be important for	04:29:15PM
15	you as a person involved with incident	04:29:17PM
16	responses to know where the various data	04:29:18PM
17	repositories were?	04:29:20PM
18	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	04:29:26PM
19	A. It would.	04:29:26PM
20	Q. Did you ask anybody are there	04:29:28PM
21	any unusual places people store important	04:29:29PM
22	information?	04:29:32PM
23	A. We did.	04:29:35PM
24	Q. And who did you talk to?	04:29:36PM
25	A. Various people that were in	04:29:46PM
		Page 231

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 13 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	record.	04:53:11PM
2	I think after the deck, started	04:53:12PM
3	doing things like this.	04:53:19PM
4	Q. Going back to the syslogs, are	04:53:24PM
5	syslogs available on the W and G laptops?	04:53:25PM
6	A. Both laptops you mean?	04:53:34PM
7	Q. Yes.	04:53:35PM
8	A. I'll reference 1312, you can	04:53:46PM
9	see in this timeline for the G laptop, we	04:53:54PM
10	do site syslogs multiple times, 16th of	04:53:57PM
11	October 2015, the 26th of January 2016,	04:54:02PM
12	31st of January 2016, and then for the O	04:54:07PM
13	laptop, Windows does not write to the same	04:54:13PM
14	syslog sources	04:54:15PM
15	Q. So the answer is yes, that	04:54:20PM
16	there are some indications of syslogs?	04:54:22PM
17	A. Yes.	04:54:24PM
18	MR. BAKER: Objection.	04:54:25PM
19	MS. GOODMAN: Let's mark this	04:54:27PM
20	as the next exhibit.	04:54:30PM
21	(Exhibit 1318, screen shot of	04:54:30PM
22	an item from WAYMO-UBER 26477, was marked	04:54:30PM
23	for identification, as of this date.)	04:54:55PM
24	Q. This is another screen shot of	04:54:55PM
25	an item from WAYMO-UBER 26477 and this	04:54:57PM
		Page 247

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 14 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	and enter HTTPS colon, slash slash	05:57:51PM
2	slash SVN slash	05:58:06PM
3	Chauffeur-SVN.	05:58:13PM
4	Do you see that?	05:58:15PM
5	A. I do.	05:58:17PM
6	Q. Have you tried to access the	05:58:24PM
7	Subversion website yourself to see how it	05:58:27PM
8	works?	05:58:30PM
9	A. I have not, as I don't have a	05:58:31PM
10	business need to access those files.	05:58:33PM
11	Q. Would it have been important	05:58:49PM
12	for you to know how it works in offering	05:58:50PM
13	your opinions?	05:58:53PM
14	A. From I asked the	05:58:57PM
15	administrator my burning questions about	05:59:07PM
16	it, but as I said before, I had no	05:59:09PM
17	business need to touch those files and	05:59:13PM
18	would rather not play with live high value	05:59:16PM
19	data and get it onto my workstation.	05:59:20PM
20	That kind of speaks to what I	05:59:26PM
21	mentioned before, data access policies.	05:59:29PM
22	Q. Do you know what happens when	05:59:38PM
23	you follow this instruction in No. 3?	05:59:40PM
24	A. I would imagine it connects you	05:59:56PM
25	to the SVN.	05:59:58PM
		Page 287

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 15 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	Q. What does SVN check out to?	06:00:03PM
2	A. Presumably downloads what has	06:00:13PM
3	been selected for check-out.	06:00:16PM
4	Q. Here what they give is the full	06:00:18PM
5	directory, right?	06:00:21PM
6	A. That seems plausible.	06:00:30PM
7	Q. So the instructions here say	06:00:32PM
8	SVN check-out and then you enter the full	06:00:34PM
9	directory, SVN Chauffeur	06:00:37PM
10	SVN?	06:00:44PM
11	A. I inquired about this yesterday	06:00:47PM
12	and what I was told is that you choose	06:00:48PM
13	what projects to, I think Jack used the	06:01:01PM
14	term, subscribe to, and then I asked if	06:01:08PM
15	you could accidently just download the	06:01:14PM
16	whole thing and he replied unlikely.	06:01:18PM
17	Q. These instructions don't tell	06:01:26PM
18	you to identify particular directories,	06:01:28PM
19	right?	06:01:29PM
20	A. They don't appear to, no.	06:01:30PM
21	Q. And Mr. Brown was not the	06:01:31PM
22	administrator when Anthony Levandowski	06:01:33PM
23	worked on Project Chauffeur, right?	06:01:35PM
24	A. I believe that is accurate.	06:01:38PM
25	Q. Does he did Mr. Brown say	06:01:39PM
		Page 288

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1906-1 Filed 09/29/17 Page 16 of 17 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	he had any co	onversation with Mr. Zbrozek	06:01:42PM	
2	about any pa:	rticularized instructions that	06:01:45PM	
3	he might be	giving?	06:01:48PM	
4	Α.	That did not come up.	06:01:51PM	
5	Q. T	What was his last name, Jack?	06:01:53PM	
6	Α.	Brown, like me.	06:01:57PM	
7	Q.	That's what's confusing, you're	06:01:59PM	
8	Mr. Brown.		06:02:01PM	
9]	Did Mr. Jack Brown tell you he	06:02:02PM	
10	had ever tall	ked to Anthony Levandowski	06:02:05PM	
11	about how to use the Chauffeur SVN system? 06:02:06PM			
12	Α.	That did not come up.	06:02:11PM	
13	Q. 1	Did you ask him?	06:02:12PM	
14	Α. Ι	No.	06:02:15PM	
15	Q. 1	Did you ever talk to	06:02:16PM	
16	Mr. Zbrozek a	about conversations he might	06:02:19PM	
17	have had with Mr. Levandowski about how to 06:02:21PM			
18	use the SVN?		06:02:23PM	
19	A. 1	No.	06:02:23PM	
20	Q. 1	We can go back to Exhibit 1312,	06:02:26PM	
21	who is Kiddi	, K-I-D-D-I?	06:02:36PM	
22	A. 1	Kristinn Gudjonsson.	06:02:39PM	
23	Q. 1	Who is some guy I know?	06:02:43PM	
24	Α.	(Indicating.)	06:02:45PM	
25	Q. 1	Why did you pick that name?	06:02:46PM	
			Page 289	

1 CERTIFICATION 2 I, Jineen Pavesi, a Registered 3 Professional Reporter, Registered Merit 4 5 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and a Notary Public, do hereby certify that 6 7 the foregoing witness, GARY BROWN, was duly sworn on the date indicated, and that 8 9 the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes. 10 11 I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any party to this 12 13 action. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Lineaux Parresi, RPR, RMR. 21 22 23 JINEEN PAVESI, RPR, RMR, CRR 24 25 Page 305